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Introduction

The Guide of the Perplexed occupies a unique and fascinating place in the history of universal literature. It is a philosophical, theological, mystical and exegetical work, while going beyond the traditional boundaries of text classification. Its purpose is to provide support for the Jewish man troubled by the dialectic between belief and knowledge, but it also articulates a thought-provoking and passionate world view. Its spiritual, philosophical and historical importance is so extensive and diverse that it is impossible to define. This jewel of universal spiritual literature admirably seeks to understand man’s relationship with himself, with others and with God, even if these relationships, as Maimonides himself recognizes in the introduction to the book, constitute an intellectual labyrinth beset with contradictions.

For this reason the work is not aimed at either dogmatic intellectuals or rational philosophers, nor is it targeted at a readership devoid of an intellectual background, but rather at those scholars who are bewildered by the apparent
contradictions between religion and philosophy: “disturbed” and “perplexed” spirits, but not wayward ones, facing attractive philosophical texts that appear to question the cherished truths that were taught to them. At the heart of Maimonidean thought we find a disoriented man, paralyzed at a crossroads between faith and reason. The book is addressed to man in general and at the same time to one specific person, the unique, well-loved, and “highly-esteemed disciple” Rabi Yosef Ibn Aknin. A marked feature of “Senecan” thought is expressed in this relationship, conferring intentionality to the work: a practical philosophy that teaches man how to live intellectually. This loyal disciple encourages his Master to develop an idea that he has treasured since youth: writing a work that could disentangle the difficulties involved in understanding the Torah and the Prophets. In order for the task to be successful, good intentions would not be enough; a philosophical disposition and a systematic acquisition of the knowledge are both required.

Since its appearance, numerous commentaries, translations, versions and controversies have accompanied the Guide of the Perplexed in its wanderings. This framework brings to light a suggestive dialectic between personal experience and the concept of human being. As soon as European Jews knew about the existence of the Moreh, they endeavoured to make it available in Hebrew. Samuel Ibn Tibbon, member of the illustrious Ibn Tibbon family from Lunel (France), shares with Maimonides his intention to translate it into Hebrew, ten years after the work had been completed. Being written in Arabic (Dalālat al-ḥā’irīn), the Guide was incomprehensible for learned French Jews, who were mainly adept at the teachings of Maimonides. Ibn Tibbon’s translation work did not only allow one of the principal works of Jewish thought to be received by diasporic Jews who did not understand Arabic, but it also established the basis for Hebrew philosophical language for centuries to come.

In his response to Ibn Tibbon’s request to translate the work (1199), Maimonides gave his approval, along with extensive advice and numerous suggestions on how to deal with such a task. Maimonides’ answer was not only of scholarly interest (he pointed out some “translation principles”) but contained also a great deal of wise and sensible advice. Maimonides himself alludes to Ibn Tibbon’s ability and intelligence:

You have asked correctly [...]. I recognize through your words that your heart descends into the greatest depths of meaning and it reveals its secrets to you—praising that—someone born among stutterers [...] could have such skill in the Arabic language—
which is just corrupted Hebrew—, and could understand all the grammatical nuances of the language and all its possible meanings.¹

The Cordovan thinker, before clarifying, on a one-off basis, the doubts and difficulties set out by Ibn Tibbon’s letter, explains what we could define as the fundamental principles of translation. These principles are: clarity, which requires a full understanding and interpretation of the original text; and a faithful reproduction of its meaning, even if one must sacrifice faithfulness to the original syntax or a precise correspondence between terms.²

Almost in the same period, the poet Yehuda Al-Harizi also converted the Guide into Hebrew at the request of the Jewish community of Marseille. He carried out his task with a style that aimed for a broad reproduction of its meaning rather than linguistic precision. He worried less about individual words and particles than about the refinement of his style. Partly for this reason, it played a central role in the first translation of the Guide into Spanish, the topic of this paper.

Both translations of Maimonides’ original Arabic ended up surpassing the original, as Arabic gradually lost importance in Spain with the advance of the Reconquista. However, the works of Ibn Tibbon and Al-Harizi are not the only medieval translations into Hebrew of the Moreh.³ Yosef Ibn Falaquera, who lived during the 13th century, composed the Moreb ha-Moreb (The Guide to the Guide), which is a commentary on the work incorporating translated fragments of it.

More than 200 years after the translation of the Guide, the Spaniard Pedro de Toledo first translated this work into a modern language. The importance of this translation lies not only on this fact, relevant in itself, but also on the whole set of circumstances linked to the manuscript in which Pedro de Toledo’s work has been preserved. Currently, this manuscript, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 10289, is the only text that we have of this Spanish translation. This manuscript in which the translation stands side by side with hundreds of comments in marginal annotations clearly shows the social crisis in Hispanic Judaism and the Spanish cultural atmosphere at the time. Our aim in this article is to illustrate these issues by analyzing some of the most meaningful passages in Pedro de Toledo’s translation and notes, as well as the numerous glosses by an anonymous scholar that reread Pedro de Toledo’s work decades later.

---

The Mostrador e enseñador de los turbados

An translation against its humanist background in the Castilian Renaissance


The library book tag of our manuscript reads: El More en castellano traducido por el Maestro Pedro de Toledo (“The More in Castilian translated by the Master Pedro de Toledo”), a text that has the alternative title Mostrador e enseñador de los turbados (“Guide and Teacher for the Troubled”). Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 10289 is a volume measuring 408×290 millimetres, and consisting of 141 folios, in two columns of 42-45 lines per page, with titles and capitals in red, handwriting from the first half of the 15th century, and a mudéjar binding. Both f. 1, containing the prologue by Pedro de Toledo on both sides of the folio; and f. 2, with the prologue by Maimonides, are illuminated with gold leaf and other colours (blue and red), applied to ornamental and vegetable motifs. The manuscript was copied by the scribe Alfonso Pérez de Cáceres. His work reflects a transitional scriptorial style, dependent on new humanistic forms.

This 15th century translation of Maimonides’ Guide into Castilian Spanish is the oldest version in a vulgar language of the Moreh nevukhim. In the research field of Jewish sources for Hispanic thought, this translation by Pedro de Toledo represents an achievement of enormous value and significance for this period. It took the translator nearly two decades to complete this arduous task (the translation of the first and second books was concluded in 1419, while the third was completed in 1432).

The translation was commissioned by Gómez Suárez de Figueroa, the brother-in-law of Íñigo López de Mendoza, Marquis of Santillana. The translator was, therefore, living in the same period as Enrique de Villena, Alonso de Cartagena and Alfonso de la Torre, who were protagonists at a time when fundamental Hispanic cultural ideas and values had emerged, and during which the practice of translation was fairly commonplace. In the very materiality of the original
text—namely in the manuscript and in later marginal notes—we find the main actors involved in this work, at the dawn of Modernity: cristianos viejos ("old Christians"), converts and Jews, all living in a period of deep transformations.

From this perspective, Pedro de Toledo would have played a crucial role within this intellectual challenge, reflecting in an exemplary way the strength of the new humanism of that time, by being ready to accept and make available a work such as the Guide.

The bulk of the translations carried out in the first half of the 15th century is related, to a greater or lesser degree, to the court of Íñigo López de Mendoza, Marquis of Santillana. His role in the development of Spanish Renaissance humanism is unanimously regarded as paramount, as demonstrated both in the setting up of his library in Guadalajara and by the group of intellectuals that worked for him. Authors like Enrique de Villena, Pedro González de Mendoza, Martín de Lucena, Alfonso de Madrigal, Alfonso Martínez de Toledo, in Spain, and Leonardo Bruni and Pier Candido Decembrio, in Italy, were among the outstanding translators that worked in Santillana’s court. Last but not least is the Bishop of Burgos (and son of conversos) Alonso de Cartagena (1385-1456), translator of Seneca’s major works and Marcus Tullius Cicero’s Rhetoric, also influential at time.

The works that make up Don Íñigo López de Mendoza, Marquis of Santillana’s library are a testament to a flourishing period: a remarkable array of translations and original works commissioned by him. Their scope is awe-inspiring: translations of the Iliad, Phaedo, the Aeneid, Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Seneca’s tragedies, The Divine Comedy, and works by Cicero, Thucydides, Livy, Saint Augustine and Maimonides, among many others. Their number and quality are proof of the undeniable merit of this monument to classic and medieval culture.⁶

**Pedro de Toledo, “trasladador”**

The limited information available about the translator’s life has led to a never-ending series of equivocations, above all because of Pedro de Toledo’s many homonyms. The data about his ancestry, origin and personal circumstances, is difficult to interpret. Scholars who have encountered his work in the last century agree fairly closely about some basic aspects: our author probably had Jewish

---

origins, and was a Jewish convert or a Jewish convert’s son. This conclusion has been drawn from the connection he shows to the text and the Hebrew language, as well as from his vision of Judaism, as it emerges in his notes and comments, and, above all, from the humility and carefulness with which he copes with the task of translating.

However, there is a general consensus in considering Pedro de Toledo son of the convert Juan del Castillo, who probably converted to Christianity in 1391. The latter also seems identifiable with Juan el Viejo de Toledo/Johan del Castillo, the author of the *Tractatus contra iudaos* (1416), a work written as a result of the Disputation of Tortosa. In assessing Pedro de Toledo’s consideration of the *Moreh*, it is worth considering that his father may well have been the author of a work abounding in Rabbinic quotations, as he attempted to show that Christianity was the true faith “using the Torah, the Talmud and even the *Sefer yetsirah*.”

In any case, the person who can provide reliable information about Pedro de Toledo is the man himself: this is found in the prologues and epilogues of his translation, transmitted in the manuscript Madrid, B. N., ms. 10289, and in the actual text of the *Guide*. There can be no doubt that Pedro de Toledo, translator of the *Moreh*, produced his work for señor Gómez Suárez de Figueroa, son of the Master of the Order of Santiago Lorenzo Suárez de Figueroa and brother-in-law of Íñigo López de Mendoza, the Marquis of Santillana.

Yo maestre Pedro de Toledo fijo de maestre Johan del Castillo fue rrogado e mandado por mj señor Gomez Suare de Figueroa, fijo del muy alto Cauallero don Lorenzo Suare de Figueroa, maestre que fue dela muy onrrada e alta orden dela Caualleria de Santiago, que rromançe el muy altisimo libro del Moreh que fizo el muy famoso sabio maestre Moysen de Egipto el Cordovyf, fijo del grande juez rrabi

---

8. Cf. Schiff, 1905, pp. 443-44; *id.*, 1897; Millás Vallicrosa, 1943, pp. 300-301; Castro, 1948, p. 502. Millás Vallicrosa believes that the translator is Jewish, while Américo Castro assumes that he is a Jewish convert; both opinions cannot be considered more than conjectures, as they do not come with any additional information.
Pedro de Toledo is aware of the difficulties of his task, given the intellectual relevance of the work and of his author. He acknowledges the significance of the *Guide* and its contribution to philosophy. The title given to the translation, *Mostrador eenseñador de los turbados*, appropriately expresses it.

As a good servant, he turns the wishes of his Master into his own objective, and he begins to undertake the task he has been entrusted with: “por le fazer plazer e escruição, plogome de voluptad ponerme al trabajo para lo trasladar de abrayco a rromançe”, a translation from Hebrew into the Romance language.

This declaration of intent gives way to interesting questions about the actual scope of the translator’s intellectual competence in the field, which can only be answered hypothetically. For the moment, let us stick with what he himself states. For him, this is an arduous and complicated task because there is no unanimity concerning the different Hebrew translations known, “*de quatro que fasta oy son*.”

In using these Hebrew translations, great importance will undoubtedly be given to the works of Ibn Tibbon and Al-Ḥarizi; the former being “*mejor en la sçiençia*,” the latter “*buena e conplida en lenguaje e muy sinple en la sçiençia*” but more deficient than the first one. However, he states that both translations are full of syntactic
and linguistic limitations, full of interpretative errors due to the inadequate work of the scribes. Does this judgement imply that he used the original Arabic text? I believe that the translator himself does not leave any room for doubt, although he doesn’t admit it openly:

Pero sepa el mj señor e todo aquel que por esta mj trasladaçion leyere e viere, quela entençion del noble maestre Moysen non fallesçera de todo su libro de comjenço fasta la fin cosa alguna, ayudandome el verdadero Dios, como quier quelos libros onde conçiero e traslado son traslados de traslados, ende conprehenden forçadamente errores muchos, asi por las diversidades de los trasladadores en diversas errores como enlas diversas errores de los diversos escrivanos.¹⁷

Why “traslados de traslados” (“translations of translations”)? Why an indirect translation from Hebrew and not from the original Judeo-Arabic? Until now, scholarly speculation has focused on the limitations of Pedro de Toledo’s translation rather than his true talents as an interpreter of Maimonides’ text. David Gonzalo Maeso, author of the best Spanish translation of the Guide from the original Judeo-Arabic, considers that—following Salomon Munk in the middle of the 19th century—Pedro de Toledo’s version of the Guide was taken from the Hebrew of Al-Harizi.¹⁸ Going further, Moshe Lazar affirms that Pedro de Toledo carried out a simultaneous—and chaotic—reading of the two cited translations (especially Al-Harizi’s one) and, “possibly” of the original Judeo-Arabic and two fragmentary translations, which the Spanish translator himself appears to refer to.¹⁹ Finally, Yitzhak Bar-Lewaw maintains that Pedro de Toledo performed his

---

¹⁷. But my Lord and all those who read and see my translation should know that the noble master Moses’s intention will not flag in any way throughout his book, from the beginning to the end, may the true God help me, even though the books from where I translate are translations of translations, which necessarily have many errors, whether caused by the different translators or by the various scribes.

¹⁸. Moses Maimónides, 2005, p. 34. At the beginning of the 20th century, also Mario Schiff, like Munk, defended the same opinion. According to him, Pedro de Toledo was not unaware of Arabic, since he profusely quotes the philosophers, which he considers as references (or that are considered as such by Maimonides himself), in their Arabic form, cf. Schiff, 1905, p. 444.

¹⁹. Lazar, 1987, p. 5; Moses Maimónides, 1989, p. IX. In his opinion, since there are no critical editions of the translations nor a genealogy of the manuscript tradition, it is difficult to reliably understand whether the translator follows with exactness or if he is influenced by a non-surviving manuscript.
task without a thorough understanding of Arabic and with a limited knowledge of Hebrew. 20

We will formulate, in accordance with the opinion of Bar-Lewaw, a third hypothesis. We believe that Pedro de Toledo had a limited knowledge of Arabic: he had studied philosophy and used the translations of classical texts of Greek philosophy, he was also versed in important matters and authors of scholastic Arabic, as his notes and glosses show, but used the Latin versions circulating around the peninsula from the 12th century onwards. 21 In addition, as an analysis of his translation shows, he had considerable difficulties with the scientific Hebrew of Ibn Tibbon. He possesses a general knowledge of the Jewish tradition, but this is clearly not a field that he masters; in fact, quite the opposite seems to be the case. Given such limitations, why would he use an Arabic manuscript written in Hebrew characters as a reference? Would it not make more sense, given his skills and his standard scholastic education, to use a manuscript of the Latin version of the Guide to carry out his romanceado (“translation into vernacular”)? Since Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas knew and quoted the Moreh, it is known that at least one Latin version existed (Dux neutrorum), probably already in circulation from the 13th century onwards. The Latin translator based his version on the Hebrew version of Al-Harizi, which clearly aligns him with Pedro de Toledo. 22

Many of these questions would require bio-bibliographic data not available. All we can do is to interpret the manuscript. Let us therefore return to the translator’s prologue.

Pedro de Toledo’s translation method

For Pedro de Toledo, the way of overcoming the endless difficulties with works such as the Moreh seems to revolve around his own translation techniques. The essential part of his strategy consists in choosing the Hebrew version that could be best adapted to each passage, and in adopting the de verbo ad verbum technique for the passages that he could not understand. Supposing that the result might be criticized in the future (as it was the case indeed) by “algunt maldezidor que se

faze sabio letrado,”23 the translator apologizes to his Master, telling him something along the lines of “you can check it all, if you wish to,” a request that in all honesty was formulated with little intellectual rigor:

> Sea de mandar leer el capítulo del abrayco [...] E la vuestra merçet, acatando e mirando cada capítulo de esta mj trasladaçion, ende verá la vuestra señoria la lealtad del buen leal eservjdor que ala vuestra merçet plaze e ama todos tiempos eservjr.24

Because of his competence in philosophy, Pedro de Toledo succeeded with acceptable translations for some of the most intricate passages, with occasional references to the Latin translation of classical sources. For example, quotations by Aristotle and his medieval followers are satisfactorily clarified in several passages of the work. Thus, in a passage in which Maimonides merges the doctrine of the Tetragrammaton with the Aristotelian concept of the active intellect, the translator inserts the following:

> Non se puede entender esto bien si non conlo que diz enel Libro del ánima e Cartas de Aben Rruyz.25

Philosophical knowledge, but not philological rigor in translation. The doubts arising from the Hebrew that “he translates” lead him to further extend the general tone of his comments:

> Trasladacçion mejor: en los conoçimjentos jntrinsicos, segunt aconteçe en los conoçimientos sensuales jntrinsicos; Nota: que eneste exemple nombro las dos que dize Aristotiles en los “predicamjentos”, que son aujtuaçion e manera, enel primer genus delas cuatro qualidades; e el abito es fuerte de estar enla manera ligera de quitar.26

23. “By someone who discredits our work and pretends to be wise and enlightened.”
24. “Order to read the chapter in Hebrew [...] And, on reading each chapter of my translation, your Lordship will see the loyalty of the good and loyal servant whose honor and pleasure is to serve your Worship at all times.”
25. F. 30b. Cf. Aristotle, Περὶ Ψ υχῆς. The Tafsīr or literal commentary is one of the three treatises of the Psychology of Averroes (Aben Rruyz) and its culmination. I, 62. “This cannot be fully understood but with the Libro del anima and Letters by Averroes.”
26. F. 21b; 23b. “A better translation: in the intrinsic knowledge, as is the case of the intrinsic sensory knowledge; note: in this first example, he named those two that Aristotle mentions in the Predicamenta, which are “habits” and “disposition,” in the first specie of the four qualities.”
A certain shroud of uncertainty seems to envelop these words. Respecting the text referred to does not imply necessarily an admiration for the original work. It could also indicate a badly feigned lack of understanding of the words’ meaning and of syntactic constructions, as well as of the institutions and the Jewish world that these represented. This lack of knowledge is one of the reasons that led him to a literal translation, as it is exemplified by the study of translations of that period. Consequently, the personal and methodological information found in the translator’s epilogues to each part of the Moreh is most revealing. These epilogues bring to the forefront his efforts, his considerations concerning the universal value of Maimonides’ work, and a series of warnings about errors that might be found in his translation. He quotes Alexander of Afrodisia:

\[ \text{Que los contradezires non rrazonables se fazen por celos e envidias, e yntenciones e malquerencias, e es señorio e tener se en mucho e loando se por via de vanagloria.} \]

We must not rule out, of course, that these errors could have been due to more “personal” limitations:

\[ \text{E así yo, por mí poco entender, quanto más mí poco saber e alcançar, por la necesidat delos necesarios trabajos mundanales.} \]

Pedro de Toledo translates “segunt la costumbre,” namely according to the techniques of his time. He is an interpreter of the work, who does not “exactly” assume the author’s point of view. But that is not all. From time to time, when he does not find a satisfactory term, he transcribes the original word within the vernacular text:

\[ \text{E para dispulsar delas fornicaçiones vedose echar el mamzer con fija de Yrrael; E dixo lo dela anjmalia e delas aues, por que non trayga corban de anjmalia, nyn trayga aue de selamjm.} \]


28. F. 90b. Epilogue to part II, infra. “That the unreasonable criticisms are caused by jealousy and envy, mean intentions and dislike, and to regard oneself very important and to praise oneself with pride is nothing but bragging.”

29. “And so I, owing to my little understanding, and, even more, to my scarce wisdom and dimmed intelligence and because of my mandatory worldly works.”

30. F. 134b: III, 49; f. 127b: III, 46. “And to dissuade from fornication it was forbidden to have the mamzer with any daughter of Israel; and about the animals and the birds, he
In other cases, a completely unknown term is just transcribed. Thus, ספר חרוטים (from הָרָעָת, "cone") is in the text “Libro de los harutim” that in Hebrew designates the Treatise of the Conic Sections, a work by Apollonius of Perga (262-190 a. c.). Another example is: “cavalgador en arabod” (from תַּרְעֹות, ‘aravot, “clouds”). In another passage, Pedro admits directly in a gloss that unintelligibility enters into the translation:

Nota que “ánima” es llamada nefes, e “folgo” es dicho yavnafas, que es cerca de nefes. E aquí se dexo un poco de gramática abrayca que es ynpossible romançar, quanto mas eser en amas trasladaciones estos desieres que son mas mentira que verdat, nyn su verdat cumple saber a vuestro eservicio.33

In fact, it is on theological matters that the translator truly makes an effort not to make any mistakes. For instance, when he translates a passage in which Maimonides criticizes the proof of God’s unity by the Mutakallimun, the original text states that: “E quiça, como piensan los Xristianos que son tres, e non es asi, que asi pensamos nos que es vno, e non es asi.”34 Pedro de Toledo, in order to be on the safe side and dispel any doubts about his faith in the Trinity, clarifies the matter in a gloss; at the same time, he shows his preference for Al-Ḥarizi’s translation:

Nota del Harizi: onde diz quelos Xristianos, e quiça dira alguno que es como pensaron los Xristianos tres, e nos non pensamos asi si non que es vno, e non es asi la cosa segunt nuestro entendimiento, e esto es claro, e cetera.35

said to bring neither corban animal nor bird of selamjm: "shallim" (shelamim); "propitiatory sacrifice"; mamzerim ("bastards"); קרבן ("sacrifice.") 31. Cf. I, 72: f. 44b. 32. Cf. I, 69: f. 34b. 33. I, 67, ובנהש (wa-yinnafash), “He rested” (Ex. 31, 17); נפש (nefesh), “soul.” F. 32b: “Note that nefes means ‘soul’ and yavnafas means “he reposed,” which is close to nefes. and here I skip some Hebrew grammar that is impossible to translate, especially as it is not necessary for your Lordship to know either translation of these sayings, which hold more deceit than truth.” 34. “And perhaps as the Christians think that He is three, and it is not so, we think that He is one, and it is not so.” 35. I, 74: f. 48b. “Note from Al-Ḥarizi: where it says that ‘the Christians’, and somebody may say that as the Christians thought ‘three’, we disagree, we think it is ‘one’,
Nevertheless, sometimes, faced with a technical matter, he compares both translations and comes to a conclusion:

Nota de Aven Tabon: e cuerpos estables enlos elementos e lo que dellos es compuesto.  

And in an even more obvious way:

Aven Tabon diz: "e esta fuerte cosa es un çielo", onde diz "grant cuenta".

And finally, on other occasions, he doubts the accuracy of both translations and suggests an alternative text that is usually unintelligible:

Por quanto este capitulo non es bueno en amas trasladaçiones, puse lo tal qual es, sin aderesçamiento de vocablos.

An intertextual argument

A manuscript illuminated with two kinds of glosses

Among the singularities of this work, written at the twilight of a world of codices, manuscripts, copyists and scribes, its function as a hermeneutic battlefield has to be mentioned. Indeed, Pedro de Toledo’s translation is presented as an endless work of interpretations: a battle is unleashed from the very transcription of the translated text, its physical location being in the material body of the book. Two kinds of glosses are present. The first kind consists of notes by the translator, copied with the text by Alfonso Pérez de Cáceres. These are terminological clarifications,
which sometimes reflect the difficulties encountered in the translation. They are brief and infrequent. The second type of annotations contain linguistic and philosophical observations, and, occasionally, critical opinions characterised by an unusual forcefulness and irony. These notes are written by a hand other than that of the scribe, an unknown character who writes them probably some decades after the completion of the translation. They are both interlinear and on-the-margins notes, but they disappear after f. 20v. The anonymous annotator is an exhaustive and precise reviewer. He has detailed knowledge of all the procedures for making reference marks and insertions: obelus, claudator, semi-claudator, and several signs and references in the margins, which are common in annotated manuscripts.

Pedro de Toledo, through the work of his scribe Alfonso Pérez de Cáceres, and the anonymous scholar are confronted in the notes: two types of distinct handwriting, two different hands that take notes in the margin and between the lines, and that “come face to face,” diachronically, in the task of untangling Maimonidean thought. The glosses of the anonymous contributor are so frequent that they almost provide an alternative translation, as well as a critical apparatus of great hermeneutic value. But what really converts them into something extremely valuable is that they transform the textual whole into a passionate and bloodless settling of scores, a war between an intellectual, almost certainly a Jew, with rigorous knowledge of Maimonides’ work, of the Jewish tradition and probably of Greek philosophy (as his glosses in chapters 30 and 31 of the manuscript, for example, seem to justify), and a translator of converso origin, Pedro de Toledo, who is not completely familiar with the inherited Jewish tradition.

The translator’s glosses, written—as already mentioned—by the same hand as the text, attempt to pour a small amount of light on terminological aspects, voices and difficult passages. However, in other cases they refer to the actual limitations of the translation, being the vehicle for expressing the “complaints” made by Pedro de Toledo about the difficulties of his arduous task. Written almost always in the margin, these notes by the translator progressively disappear over the length of the text, above all in the transition from the first to the second part, reappearing, though not excessively, in the section dedicated by Maimonides to the clarification of ritual precepts, in the third part of the Moreh. Through

these notes, the translator seems to reveal a certain amount of dissatisfaction, a doubtful and anxious look at what he has done, and on the process of translation. A permanent feeling of indecisiveness gravitates around the translator. He is rarely content with his work, expressing his feelings and perceptions with complete sincerity, although with a pronounced and quite grovelling tendency to place the responsibility of possible errors on others or onto material difficulties outside of his control. For instance:

> Non me parece que este capítulo vaya amj voluntat, por la error que falle en mi libro, mas fize lo que pude; por la error demij libro non es este capítulo muy aderezado, e non pude mas. 41

When facing difficulties, he repeatedly opts for the *de verbo ad verbum* methodology, that according to him saves the work from mistakes:

> Por que este capítulo es sotil e ha menester fuerte estudio, escriuo todo lo demas vocablo por vocablo por non errar. 42

Sometimes the translator expresses himself with undisguised friendliness. In comments loaded with emotional sincerity, he presents, as an apology, some explanations that almost express a feeling of desperation. He confesses to his Master Gómez Suárez:

> Señor, non puede al fazer, que amas trasladaçiones en esto por tales que non an seso njn rrazon romançadas, e rresçebid lo que mejor puedo, que non puedo mas. 43

This regret softens on some of the many occasions when Pedro de Toledo expresses satisfaction with his work, in an almost childish way:

> Este capítulo va acabadamente, justo e bueno, que mas non puede ser. 44

---

41. F. 11a, 12b. “The rendering of this chapter is not to my liking, because of the error I found in my book, but I did what I could; because of the mistake in my book, this chapter has not turned out too well, and I couldn’t do any better.”

42. F. 71a. “Because this chapter is complex and needs hard study, I write the rest word by word so as not to err.”

43. F. 23a. “My Lord, I could not do it, for both translations are of such a kind that there is no point in translating them, so receive the best that I could, for I can no more.”

44. F. 33b. “I finished this chapter the best I could: accurate and good.”
The anonymous anti-translator. A diachronic controversy

The anonymous glosses contain linguistic, philosophical and theological clarifications together with critical opinions expressed with unusual forcefulness and irony. These characteristics make the work of the annotator exceptional. The skills of this anonymous and wise commentator, who dealt with the clarification of the Talmudic texts, and his mastery of Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic make us think that he probably was a Jew close to the circle of the Marquis of Santillana. His more than one thousand five hundred notes transform the original handwritten text into an object of scrupulous and rigorous correction; the entries by the translator, written by the scribe’s hand, are in Book I: 94, in Book II: 20, in Book III: 72. The entries by the annotator are 1563. The total number of notes in the manuscript is 1749. But another mystery surrounds ms. 10289, since these notes disappear after f. 20v. Until this point, the annotator plays the function of an alternative translator to such an extent that he could be referred to as an anti-translator.

The anonymous annotator, in Bar-Lewaw’s words, hates the translator like a Jew hates a new Christian, but with an intellectual rigor that Pedro de Toledo does not show in certain fields, he fills the text with hundreds of notes. Pedro’s general knowledge, linguistic skills and translation choices are all drastically questioned therein. For instance, while considering an hermeneutic strategy of the translator in his prologue, the annotator forcefully questions whether the former is able to carry out the task. The translator states that:

_E por quanto los traslados son diversos e de diversos letrados, buenos e comunales e ningunos (1), e los escriuanos otrosy todos por ser non letrados (2) erraron yerros manifestos [...] quanto mas que amos trasladadores erraron (3) en muchas cosas, e el uno mas que el otro sin comparacion, porque es sabido eser bueno e complido en lenguaje e muy simple en la sciençia, e nonbrase Harizi; e el mejor en la sciençia, nonbrase Aven Tabbon. Mas fio en el Dios alto... (4)._}

45. Cf. Bar-Lewaw, 1966, p. 61: “He seems to be Jewish. Although, we should note that this is no more than a supposition, given that we do not have any news about this annotator who is full of wisdom and science.” Cf. also Schiff, 1905, p. 431: “Très versé dans le questions de langue et connaissant le texte arabe du More Nebochim.”


47. “And since the translations are diverse and from different translators, good and average and none (1), and the scribes—all being uneducated (2)—also made glaring errors [...
The anonymous annotator responds with the following notes, halfway between intellectual criticism and ironic censorship:

(1) *Non se que quiere dezir aqui ningunos; si sera error descriuano?*

(2) *Non son todos los escriuanos non letrados, nin todos erraron, nin mucho menos los trasladadores commo dize, segunt paresçera luego adelante, que el autor mismo vio la trasladaçion de Aben Tabbon, e la ovo por buena, avn que este trasladador diga que todos erraron, commo lo dize luego aqui adelante: que amos trasladadores erraron; mal sy penso descargar de si e cargar sobrellos; (3) Saluo su graçia, que el mismo compoonedor raby Moysen de Egipto vio la trasladaçion de Aben Tabbon e la auctorizo. Verdad es que la del Harizi es errada, e la suya mas; (4) Fiar en Dios buena cosa es, mas non se quito por todo esto que non es su trasladaçion errada, e non de poco; mas, commo dixo el sabio Salamon: por muchedunbre de palabras non se quita el yerro.*

Pedro de Toledo’s prologue is gradually accompanied by more and more glosses by the anonymous commentator. The annotator gives no respite to the translator, producing a sort of *anti-prologue*, which sometimes serves as a critical summary at the beginning of the work. The annotator asks the readers of this 15th century manuscript: How can Toledo justify his difficulties with the translation as the result of deficiencies in the original Hebrew text (something that could have originated in Al-Ḥarizi’s translation), when there is an “official”

above all as both translators were wrong (3) in many things, and one incomparably more so than the other, because one is proficient in the language and very simple in science, and his name is Harizi; and the best in science is called Aven Tabbon. But I trust in the Almighty God ... (4).”

48. F. 1a. However, scribe’s errors were so common that even Maimonides himself commented to Ibn Tibbon that: “I saw the places in our extensive treatise that have caused you to have doubts, and those that have surprised you due to the scribe’s errors”, *cf. Moses Maimónides, 1988, p. 114. “(1) I don’t know what *none* means here. Is it a scribe’s error? (2) Not every scribe is illiterate, nor all of them missed, let alone the translators, as he says. As we will see later, the author himself saw Aben Tabbon’s translation and deemed it good, even if this translator says that all erred, as he says later on, that both translators erred; it was wrong if he thought to clear his blame and put it on them; (3) Except for yourself; The very author Rabbi Moysen of Egypt saw Aben Tabbon’s translation and sanctioned it. It is true that Harizi’s translation is wrong, but his is even more so; (4) Trust in God is a good thing, but that does not make his translation less wrong, and not by little; However, as wise Solomon said, *a multitude of words doesn’t erase the mistake.*”
translation by Ibn Tibbon, authorized by Maimonides himself? The translator’s hermeneutic-methodological choice is inconsistent, since it is based on a combination of a tentative-contextual translation and a literal and technical one. Both these strategies are intended to overcome the difficulties encountered in the text. Nonetheless, the annotator seems to ask: How can anyone assume the right of choosing the best translation of a specific passage, when this person is not even fluent in the language (or languages) of the original? After the Prologue, no choices made by the translator satisfy the anonymous scholar. His glosses range from pointing out subtle linguistic nuances to correcting entire paragraphs; from clarifications of biblical passages, quoted in an incomplete or inexact way, to profound exegetical explanations. Let us focus on the latter.

For instance, when Maimonides clarifies the meaning of ילד (yalad) in Is. 55, 10 on irrigating the land: “of fertilizing and germinating,” the passage is poorly translated as “pario e crecio.” A clarifying note is added by Pedro de Toledo stating that: “otro romance diz ‘nasçio e creció’.” The annotator corrects this by indicating that: “mas el romançio verdadero es: ‘e fázela engendrar e fázela creçer que esta es la lluvia a la tyerra’, e el ebrayco es veholida vehiçmiha.”

The translator’s clarifications give sometimes occasion for new comments by the annotator, corrections deriving from the original text intended to establish the correct order and meaning of the translation. In order to reveal the deficiency of the translation, the best method is to resort to the idea that Maimonides wishes to express. For instance, when Pedro de Toledo inserts his explanation of כסה (kisse) in the following note: “nota que quiere dezir ‘sin silla’, ante que mundo era, e ‘con silla’, desque fue mundo,” the annotator indicates that: “non pareçe eser asy, mira en el margin de yusu.” At the bottom of the page, the term is expressed in all of its meanings, as Maimonides relates it to the Shekhinah:

Allego algun poco de sapiencia de profecía sobre algunos denos, llamo la posança dela profecía sobre el profeta o posada del su onor, que es llamada Sehina en ebrayco, llamolo decender a aquel su posar

49. I, 7. F. 8b.
50. “It gave birth and grew”; “Another translation says: ‘was born and raised’.”
51. Cf. Is. 55, 10: “והולידה והצמיחה.” “But the truthful translation is, “and it makes it beget and grow, the rain to the Earth,” and in Hebrew it is we-holidah we-hitsmiḥah.”
52. “Note that means “without chair,” before the world came to be, and “with chair,” after the world came to be.”
53. “It doesn’t seem like that, look at the bottom margin.”
en logar e llamo el quitamyento de la manera de la tal profecía del tal
varon, el quitamyento de la dicha Sehina del tal logar, llamolo sobir
e cualquier descender o sobir, que los fallares apropiados al Criador,
cyertamente la entençion en ellos es esta rrazon, e cata bien, e çetera.⁵⁴

We could speculate that what seems apparent in this intellectual confrontation
is the rejection of anyone who feels personally united with a tradition that he
understands and considers to be superior, against an especially objectionable type
of intromission: a scholar and translator that should know the content of his task
in depth but fails to do so. This lack of knowledge goes to the extreme of not being
able to differentiate between the Mishnah and the Talmud and its comments,
which evidently implies not knowing or confusing a large part of Maimonides’
work. In the following passage: “nuestra compusiçion del Talmud, que es llamada
’Segunda Ley’”⁵⁵ the translator notes: “nota que son dos leyes la del Talmud e la de
escriptura”,⁵⁶ while the anonymous annotator clarifies that:

Non faze este notable aquí aproposito, que non dize aqui ‘segunda
ley’, nín por la ley descriptura, nín por el Talmud, salvo por la
compilacion suya del actor que aquella llama ‘segunda Ley’.⁵⁷

Here the annotator tries to clarify the ambiguity in the translation, as well as
the relationship between commentary and what is commented upon; the “segunda
Ley” (“second Law”) is nothing other than the Mishneh Torah, Maimonides’
commentary. The translator’s lack of knowledge in the field of Jewish tradition is
no secret; he himself recognizes this. Nonetheless, this limitation often “irritates”
the annotator, who does not let it go unnoticed.

Being aware of the contradictions that a work such as the Guide of the Perplexed
could confront any scholar with, Maimonides treats in the Prologue the question

⁵⁴. I, 10. F. 9b. “He gave us some of the prophetic wisdom. He called the coming of the
Prophecy upon the Prophet or the grace of his honor “descending” onto that grace, called
Shekbinah in Hebrew, and called the loss of prophecy, the loss of such Shekbinah, “going
up,” so mind that any “descending” or “going up” applied to the Creator certainly stems
from here, etc.”
⁵⁵. “Our compilation of the Talmud, which is called Second Law.”
⁵⁶. “Note that there are two laws: the Talmud and the Scriptures.”
⁵⁷. F. 3b. “This gloss makes no sense here, for it doesn’t say ‘second law’ here, neither
in reference to the Scripture, nor to the Talmud, except for his compilation called
‘Second Law’.”
of contradictions. He considers the immense value of truth that exists in the Jewish tradition, in which apparently contradictory Rabbinic opinions live in harmony. In order to do this, he cites a passage from the treatise *Shabbat.* The possibility of confusing “contradiction” with “concealment,” referring to the revealed truth, generates a new dialectic in the form of a gloss. The translator notes that:

> Nota que dixieron en el Talmud: “Salamon non te abonda que tus palabras encubren alas palabras de tu padre, si non las tuas se encubren estas destas”.

To which the annotator responds with the following insertion:

> Onde quiere que se fallare en este prologo este vocablo que dize encubyerta es error del trasladante, quo lo auia de trasladar contradiccion, conmmo ya lo he puesto enel margin desta otra parte. Mas por el notable que esta en fin desta lamjna, onde dize “nota que dixieron enel Talmud”, e avn ally lo erro, que onde dize encubren avra de dezir contradizen, mas aquella contradicçion non es salvo al pareçer por querer encobrir la rrazon del pueblo como dize.

The intellectual authority of the annotator is unquestionable. He is an expert in Biblical exegesis and he does not overlook any significant omissions made to the meaning of the original text. Even if it is only a terminological clarification, he uses impeccable hermeneutics to account for a semantic decision. Maimonides’ commentary on 1 S. 6, 5: “Create images from the boils and rats that have destroyed the country and then you will once again know the glory of God”, is translated by Pedro de Toledo in the following way:

> E asi: “en formas de vuestras moroydas”, (1) quela voluntat era desechar el dapño de las almoroydas e non su figura. E si non pode eser que non sea la forma delas almoroydas formas por la figura e semejança, estonçe sera forma nombre equiuoco o dubdoso, el qual se

---

59. “Note that they said in the Talmud, Solomon, doesn’t suffice you that your words cover your father’s words, and yours are covered with these?”
60. F. 5b. “Wherever we find the word *cover* in this prologue, it is an error of the translator, who must have translated it as *contradict*, as I have put it on the margin of this other part. But regarding the gloss that is at the end of this page, where it says, ‘note that they said in the Talmud’, even there he was mistaken, because where it says *cover* it should say *contradict*, but that contradiction refers to the will to dim the people’s reason.”
Then, the annotator showcases his biblical competence:

(1) Moroydas: en el primero libro de los Reyes, capitulo sexto, que esto es en el Libro de Samuel, profeta, se dize: que quando los felisteos cautivaron el arca en que estavan las tablas dela ley e la levaron a su yerra, que en tanto quela tuvieron alla nunca les menguaron trabajos, especialmente dize que les acaeçieron morroydas, por lo qual oyeron en acuerdo dela enbiar a los ebreos de quien lo avian tomado, e por conocimiento de satisfaçion acordaron de fazer çiertas figuras de morroydas de oro porque sanasen delas morroydas que ellos tenyan en sus cuerpos e pusieronlas en vn arcaç, cerca de la Arca, e outras cosas mas, segund que alla se cuenta; agora dize el auctor que llamo a las figuras de las morroydas çelem, non por las figuras mas por lo que dellas sesperava, que era sanar delas morroidas, asi que çelem non diga por la exterior figura mas por cosa ynterior como dixo.

The comments and corrections occasionally pave the way for a real philological and exegetical settling of scores. For example, this can be analysed in the use of corrective glosses in I, 3, dedicated to the analysis of the terms תמונה (temunah), “form,” and תבנית (tavnit), “figure.” We have inserted the gloss and commentary in its original place, using square brackets.

---

61. I, 1. F 6b, dedicated to צלם (tselem), “image.” “And thus, ‘In forms of your boils’ (1) where the intention was to discard the damage of the boils and not their figure. And if the form of the boils cannot be form by their figure and likeness, then ‘form’ will be an equivocal or doubtful name, which is said about the special form and generator of the figures of the natural bodies and of their forms.”

62. (1) “Tumors: In the first book of the Kings, chapter six, in the book of Prophet Samuel, it is said that when the Philistines appropriated the Ark in which were the Tables of the Law and took it to their land, while they had it there, things never ceased to happen, especially it says that they suffered from tumors, so they decided to send it to the Hebrews, those from whom they had taken it, and satisfied with this they decided to make figures of golden tumors to heal the tumors that they had in their bodies, and they put them in an ark, near the Ark, and some other things, according to what is told there; now the author says that he called the figures tselem, not for the figures themselves but for what was expected of them, which was to heal the tumors, so tselem should not be said in the outward meaning of figure, but in its inner meaning, as he said.”
Capítulo tercero ["capítulo tercero: temuna y tabnit, que son maneras de nombres de figuras"]

Parece al corazón que "figura" (temuna) e tabnit ["piensase que el vocablo de temuna e el vocablo de tabnit"] en abrayco ["porque amos se romançian figura, que sean una cosa"] una cosa, e non es así, que tabnit es deriuado de "fraguvar" (banah), ["binyan, que quiere dezir fraguamiento"] e la su manera es aderesçamiento ["el fraguamiento"] dela cosa e su compusición, en su quadrar, ["quadrangularidad es cuadrada"] e su circular, [circularidad] e su triangular, [triangularidad] e sus semejantes delas figuras, segunt diz: "al fraguamiento del Tabernaculo ["nota que tabnit se equivoca en fraguamiento e figura"]; gl.: "enel Esodo, capítulo 'del tabnit del Tabernaculo', lo qual quiere dezir: a la figura, e derivado quier seer fraguamiento"] e a fraguamiento de todos sus esturmentos"; "Como sus fraguamientos que te fue mostrado enel monte"; "Fraguamiento de todo pasaro"; [Deutronomio, capítulo] "Fraguamiento de mano de omne"; "Fraguamiento del palaçio". E por esto non troxo el lenguage del abrayco ["estos vocablos de tabnit e cosas dependientes del nuestro Señor en ninguna"] enel Criador en ninguna manera. 63

Conclusion

The annotator exhibits self-confidence and rigor, while the translator shows a lack of understanding or uncertainty. The annotator’s competent use of the original texts and his exhaustive knowledge of Hebrew and Judeo-Arabic confers to the alternative translation an enormous value. If we dare to suggest a risky

63. F. 7b. "Chapter three [‘Chapter three: temunah and tavnit, which are two different words for figures’] It gives the impression that ‘figure’ (temunah) and tavnit [‘consider the word temunah and the word tavnit’] in Hebrew [‘because they both are translated as figure, which is one thing’] are one thing, but this is not so, because tavnit is derived from ‘to build’ (banah), [‘binyan, which means building’] and its way is to prepare [‘the pattern of’] the thing and its composition, in its quadrature, [‘quadrangularity if it is square’] and its circular, [‘circularity’] and its triangular [‘triangularity’] and its similar figures, according to what he says, ‘The pattern of the Tabernacle [‘Note that tavnit is equivocal in pattern and figure’]; gl.: in the Exodus, chapter of the ‘tavnit of the Tabernacle’, which means ‘at the figure’, and as a derivative it means forging’] and the pattern of all its instruments’; [‘These words of tavnit and things dependant on our Lord in any way’]."
interpretation, the great number of annotations gives the impression that this anonymous scholar wants to vindicate himself for the sake of posterity, denouncing the huge mistake of not having been given the whole task of the translation from the beginning. In any case, the critical dialogue between the glosses and the text is both exciting because of the personal bias and enormously enriching in an intellectual sense.

The cases are countless. The page is a “battlefield,” although it is of course an intellectual and bloodless one, a “glossed battlefield.” This astonishing and stimulating intellectual battle unfolds in the first twenty pages of the medieval manuscript. In the final part of f. 20, at the beginning of an explainatory paragraph, the voice of the alternative anonymous annotator and translator disappears. Pedro de Toledo translates: “e se diz por el entendimiento, donde esta la vida.”64 This part is annotated by the anonymous person with: “tan bien, e es principio dela vida del animal bivo.”65 From here onwards, the work becomes the original monologue of Pedro de Toledo or, if one prefers, a surprising dialogue with himself and dealing with his intellectual limitations in the form of glosses.

A series of fascinating enigmas open up before us. Was the anonymous annotator unwilling or unable to continue? Who was he really? Was he someone from the studium of the Marquis of Santillana? This latter idea is backed up by two pieces of evidence. First, the features of the aforementioned anonymous glosses and their insertion in the text date them just a few decades after Pedro de Toledo’s translation; second, the fact that the manuscript belonged to the Marquis’ library in his Guadalajara Castle (both library and castle were inseparable properties by will), and which his son, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, first Duke of Infantado, inherited after his death, suggests that the anonymous scholar belonged to Mendoza’s court. Perhaps a Jewish intellectual hired by the Marquis to revise the text by Pedro de Toledo? Was he a rival? What benefit would it have been to have had a complete translation of the Guide of the Perplexed carried out by this unknown scholar? But at this point we lack the objective data to make any definitive statement, nor evidence that will allow us to connect the anonymous scholar to some of the known Jewish or converso scholars from the studium or the intellectual circle of Iñigo López de Mendoza. We believe that all these questions are worthy of consideration to better understand the first translation into a Romance language of the Moreh nevukhim. All the passages for which his glosses provide an alternative translation because of the limitations of the “official”

64. “And this is said about the mind, where life is.”
65. “And is the primary reason of the living being.”
translator do not belittle the work of Pedro de Toledo. In fact, the opposite is true. It is an alternative praxis that increases the overall value of ms. 10289, converting it into a sensational example of the translator’s very high intellectual level in a period of Hispanic cultural history that has been unfairly forgotten.
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Abstract: More than 200 years after the translation of the *Guide* into Hebrew, the Spaniard Pedro de Toledo first translated this work into a modern language. The importance of this translation (*Mostrador e enseñador de los turbados*) lies not only on this fact, relevant in itself, but also on the whole set of circumstances linked to the manuscript in which Pedro de Toledo’s work has been preserved. Currently, this codex, the Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 10289, is the only text that we have of this Spanish translation. This manuscript in which the translation stands side by side with hundreds of comments in marginal annotations clearly shows the social crisis in Hispanic Judaism and the Spanish cultural atmosphere at the time. Our aim in this article is to illustrate these issues by analyzing some of the most meaningful passages in Pedro de Toledo’s translation and notes, as well as the numerous glosses by an anonymous scholar that reread Pedro de Toledo’s work decades later.

Keywords: Pedro de Toledo, *Mostrador e enseñador de los turbados*, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 10289, *Guide’s* first translation into a modern language, anonymous commentator, intertextual argument.

Résumé : Plus de deux cents ans après la traduction du *Guide* en hébreu, l’Espagnol Pedro de Toledo traduira pour la première fois cette œuvre dans un langage moderne. L’importance de cette traduction ne repose pas seulement sur ce fait, en lui-même remarquable, mais aussi sur l’ensemble des circonstances associées au manuscrit dans lequel le travail de Pedro de Toledo a été préservé. Ce codex, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, ms. 10289, est le seul texte que l’on possède de cette traduction en espagnol. Ce manuscrit dans lequel la traduction est accompagnée de centaines de gloses marginales, témoigne de la crise sociale du judaïsme espagnol et de l’atmosphère culturelle dans l’Espagne de l’époque. Notre article tentera d’illustre ces problèmes à partir d’une analyse de certains des passages les plus significatifs de la traduction de Pedro de Toledo et de ses notes, ainsi que des nombreuses gloses d’un lettré anonyme qui relut l’œuvre de Pedro de Toledo quelques décennies plus tard.


تمحز: بمتعش مماثليه ينن لآتم حرموه مذ مدرموه تي مزي، مدرموه جيشر بفسك مراشلون لشفن مذ مدرموه ع تي مسفييد فردي مولايل. مشرلون مذ مدرموه مذ نمتعا نا فرك بنتن و، ألام نم مكللل مسبيوت المفاييم أت دكة ود ناهي مذ مشرلون مسفييد.
Medieval and Early Modern Translations of Maimonides’ Guide of the Perplexed – n° 22

מלות מפתח: פדרו מטולידו, התרגום הראשון של מורה נבוכים לשפה מודרנית, פרשן אנונימי, ויכוח בין-טקסטואלי.

(כ“מדריד, הספירהיה אלאדום 10289). בכמה הדר מזוהז מתוך הערות שלוחים השופכות אור על המשבר החשוב של עולם ספגד ועלאיליה התרבויותyx בברומד בית. ובעזרת זה נמיה להבניה בעית של ככמת שהשכין והשכינה והחברים של פדרו בוותרותיו כמד

ולמה בנהיה שלילם פפראס וענני צמד הנה בברומד ביתは何ועה לעי ממלדה ענני

פפראס מתנה פדרו מטולידו, התורגנーム הראשה של מורה נב ngo למדריד, פרשן אנונימי, וכתב וו-סקטואלי.